



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

government are religion, justice, counsel, and treasure; and that when any of them are shaken, 'men need to pray for fair weather.' In the same warning spirit, in which the English philosopher uttered this sentiment, we may say, that if the individuals now at the head of the government have strength to maintain themselves in the administration of affairs, the policy of conciliation and compromise in regard to political opponents, of vigorous retrenchment of the national expenditure, and of economical disbursement of the finances, is the only course they can pursue with safety. If, on the contrary, they fall into the error of their predecessors, and adopt a vindictive and proscriptive system, their early downfall, and a revival of civil war in its most hideous form, may be expected. Should such be the result, so great will be the exasperation on all sides, that it is impossible to realise the horrors which will ensue. Revenge on one side, and despair on the other, will induce the most fearful sacrifices. Rumors of the immediate approach of such confusion have already reached this country, and unhappily there is little reason to withhold credit from them. We regard the situation of Mexico with deep solicitude, and shall hail with sincere delight the hour when, emerging from the gloomy cloud, in which she now is, and has long been enveloped, she can assume that station in the family of nations, to which her real importance entitles her. Prejudice and error will, we trust, in time be dissipated. The steady light of refined intelligence will be shed over this portion of mankind, and the free institutions of our neighbor, like the bright summits of her own snowy mountains shining through a pure atmosphere, must be objects of genuine interest and admiration. When that day arrives, we may repose some confidence in republican sympathies.

ART. VII.—*Report of the Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom were referred the Memorials for and against prohibiting the Transportation of the Mails and the Distribution of Letters on Sunday.*

Counter Report of the Minority of the same Committee.

The laws of the United States which regulate the operations of the Post-Office Department, although they contain no specific

provision on the subject, have been supposed by the executive officers of the Government to authorise the transportation of the mail, and the distribution of letters on Sunday. Whether this construction be conformable to the intentions of the Legislature, or to the spirit, which has prevailed in the construction of the laws, which regulate the operations of all the other departments of the Government, may well be doubted. The practice of the Post-Office certainly forms an exception to that of all the other branches of the administration, whether of the General or State Governments, in all their ramifications, as well to that of the citizens at large, both in their individual and corporate capacities. The sittings of Congress and of all the State Legislatures are regularly suspended on Sunday. The courts of justice, the custom-houses, the banks, the land-offices, the compting-rooms, offices, warehouses, and shops of private individuals, are all closed on that day. The Post-Office alone continues its usual labors with unremitted activity, and with but little variation in its modes of proceeding. As the laws which regulate the operations of all the other departments, although equally silent on the subject, have been all construed to intend a discontinuance of the transaction of business on Sunday, it would perhaps have been more natural to put a similar construction on the Post-Office laws. For some reason or other—probably by the effect of mere accident—a different system has prevailed, and the practice of this branch of the public service has hitherto formed, as we have just remarked, an exception to the rule observed in all the rest.

The singularity of this circumstance, to whatever cause it may have been owing, has for some time past attracted the attention of many of the citizens in all parts of the country, and numerous memorials have been annually transmitted to Congress, setting forth the supposed inconveniences of the present state of things, and requesting such a modification of the existing laws, as would effect a change. Other memorials have in turn been transmitted in favor of perseverance in the existing system. There is no appearance of any improper or dangerous motive for these proceedings on either side ; nor have those who have taken part in them been arrayed on one side or the other according to any sectarian divisions. The several religious sects, which, from their agreement in certain fundamental points of belief, are popularly denominated *orthodox*, are among those, which are apparently most desirous of a change in the existing practice ;

while some other sects of considerable influence in particular parts of the country, and which hold a different opinion upon the points alluded to, have appeared to agree with their orthodox brethren upon this. It is understood that one of the petitions for a change in the existing practice was drawn up and headed by a justly respected Unitarian clergyman of this city, and extensively signed by individuals of the same persuasion. As the memorials in favor of a change proceed from citizens of all the different religious sects, it is probable, although we have not so direct a knowledge of the fact, that the same is the case with those who pray for the maintenance of the existing system. Both parties are, no doubt, equally honest in their belief of the expediency of the courses which they respectively recommend. The memorials on the subject, transmitted to the last and present Congress, were referred to committees which reported in both houses against a change. The petitioners are, however, apparently not discouraged, and will probably continue their efforts at the future sessions of Congress. The question, like every other connected with religious belief and practice, naturally excites a strong interest throughout the community; and we have thought that a few remarks upon it might not be uninteresting to some of our readers. The report, which forms the immediate subject of this article, is attributed to Colonel Johnson of Kentucky, who acted as chairman of the committee, and who had previously, when acting in the same capacity in the Senate, made a report on the same subject to that body, corresponding very nearly in substance with this. The counter-report, or protest, of the minority is attributed to Mr. Macreary.

Whenever any change is proposed in the existing laws, or the practice under them, it rests, as a general rule, with the party or person recommending it, to prove its necessity or expediency; and on this principle it would belong to the petitioners against the present system to show that it ought to be abolished. In this particular case, however, it strikes us that the general presumption against innovation, and in favor of existing laws and practices, considered as such, is rebutted by the fact to which we have already adverted—that the practice in the Post-Office Department is different from that which prevails in all the others. If the people, acting in their corporate capacity through their different agents, consider it a religious duty to suspend all the other operations of Government on Sunday, a presumption arises, that those of the Post-Office should also be suspended

for the same reason. The presumption being then in favor of a change, the burden of proof rests with those who support the existing system ; and it belongs to them to show why the practice in the Post-Office Department ought to form an exception to that which prevails in all the others, and why the same religious considerations, which induce the people to suspend all their other political and private labors on Sunday, should not induce them to discontinue the transportation of the mail and the distribution of letters.

The committee, though apparently actuated by good intentions, and a laudable anxiety to maintain the political and civil rights of the citizens, have, we think, been led into error by not advertng sufficiently to the considerations detailed above. So far, indeed, are they from appearing to be aware, that the practice of the Post-Office Department is an exception from the rule observed in all the others, that they evidently consider the petitioners for a change in this practice as endeavoring to make it such. Thus they inquire, in the course of their report, ‘ Why the petitioners have confined their prayer to the mails—why they have not requested, that the Government be required to suspend all its executive functions on that day—why they have not required that our ships shall not sail—that our armies shall not march—that officers of justice shall not seize the suspected or guard the convicted?’ The committee, when they put these questions, had obviously lost sight of the fact, that all the other functions of Government—executive, legislative, and judicial—are in fact suspended on Sunday, excepting in a few particular cases, like those which they enumerate, and which are made exceptions to the general rule on account of the great inconvenience which would result from its observation. If the jailer, for instance, were to suspend the exercise of his duty on Sunday, his prisoners would all escape ; so that there is an absolute necessity for his continuing it. If the commander of an army were to suspend the exercise of his functions every seventh day, his adversary might, under certain critical circumstances, obtain such an advantage over him, as would decide the fate of a campaign—perhaps the political situation of the country. Here the inconvenience of observing the rule is so great as to produce a moral necessity of violating it, and so of all the other cases mentioned. The practice of the Post-Office can only be justified, if at all, in the same way, as a case of exception. The report, by not advertng to this circumstance, and by em-

ploying in support of the present system only certain general considerations, which might be applied with equal force in any other branch of the public service, proves either too much or nothing at all. The inconveniences apprehended by the committee from a discontinuance of the existing system, are of a remote and prospective kind, such as the tendency to a union of Church and State, and the inconvenience of diminishing in any way the activity of the business of private life. Now it is quite obvious, that these inconveniences, if there be any danger at all of their occurrence, would be as likely to result from a discontinuance on Sunday of the business of any other department as of that of the Post-Office. If the suspension of the transportation of the mail on that day have a tendency to bring about a union of Church and State—an apprehension which we believe to be wholly groundless—it is clear to us, that a suspension of the sessions of Congress, of the State Legislatures, or of the courts of justice, must have the same tendency in a still greater degree, in proportion to the superior importance of the business which would thus be kept in abeyance. Hence the reasoning of the committee, as we have just remarked, tends, as far as it has any weight, to show that the whole business of the administration ought to proceed with the same activity on Sunday as on any other day of the week. The argument, if it prove any thing, proves a great deal too much; and of course in reality proves nothing.

This defect in the reasoning of the committee is obviously a fatal one, and we are of course authorised, without seeking for any other, to reject their conclusion. It may not, however, be improper, considering the interesting character of the question, to examine a little more particularly the real importance of the objections alleged by them, to the application in the Post-Office Department of the same rule which is observed in all the others. These objections, as we have already seen, by proving too much, prove nothing—but independently of this defect, and supposing that we were willing to admit their validity to the full extent to which they can be applied, it will appear, we think, on examination, that they have in fact little or no real weight for any purpose. They are, if we rightly understand the reasoning of the report, the two following;

1. The tendency of the suspension of the transportation of the mail, and the distribution of letters on Sunday, to effect a union of Church and State.

2. The practical inconvenience which would result from such a measure, in the diminished activity of the ordinary business of life.

The second of these objections is the only one which appears to us to possess much plausibility, but as the former is that on which the committee insist most strongly, and which they evidently regard as the more important of the two, it may be proper to give it a moment's consideration.

On this head it is argued by the committee, that there are various opinions in the community, as to the proper manner of observing the Sabbath ; that each individual has hitherto been left to pursue his own course ; but that the effect of suspending the transportation of the mail on that day, would be to decide the question in favor of those who prefer a particular system, and would therefore come within the spirit of the clause of the constitution, which prohibits any legislative preference of one religious sect over another. It does not appear to have occurred to the committee, when they employed this argument, that the act of Congress regulating the transportation of the mail must necessarily provide either for carrying it or not carrying it on Sunday ; and that if a provision for not carrying it be decisive of the question at issue between the sects in favor of one, a provision for carrying it is of course as decisive in favor of another. This being the case, it is obvious that the existing system involves precisely the same violation of the spirit of the constitution, which, if any, would result from the other.

It is plain to us, however, that there is not in either case, any violation of the spirit of the constitution, as there is confessedly none of the letter. The enactment of a law regulating the transportation of the mail is admitted to be within the power of Congress, and this law must, as we have just remarked, provide either for carrying or not carrying it on Sunday. In adopting one or the other part of the alternative, each member of Congress will naturally be governed by his own views of expediency and duty, excepting so far as he may have the instructions of his constituents. If he would hesitate as a private individual to travel or order his agents to travel on Sunday upon his own business, he will probably in like manner decline, as a representative of the people, to order their agents so to do. If on the other hand, he would feel no scruple on the subject in his private capacity, he would probably feel none in his public one. In either case, it does

not appear to us, that he imposes any trammels upon the consciences or acts of others. Each member of the community retains the same right that he possessed before of travelling or not travelling on Sunday, according to his own peculiar views, and, if these views have not been carried into effect by his political representative, he retains in full force his former right of giving his vote for another at the next election. In all this we can discern no appearance of any thing unconstitutional, either in letter or spirit, or of any thing at variance with the regular routine of ordinary legislation.

It is intimated, indeed, by the committee, that a political representative ought not in any case to be guided in the discharge of his official duty by religious considerations, and the same opinion is still more decidedly expressed in certain newspaper essays on the subject, that have happened to fall under our observation ; the writer of which considers the 'being influenced in the exercise of temporal power by religious belief,' as neither more nor less than the union of Church and State, and afterwards declares, that 'it is the sacred duty of a representative, before he gives his vote upon a point any wise connected with religious considerations, to search the inmost recesses of his conscience, and to ascertain that religious belief is not operating in his mind as a motive to that vote.' But, independently of the objection already stated to this argument, as applied to the present case, namely, that a vote in favor of carrying the mail on Sunday is as much given from religious considerations, though of a different kind, as one against it, it is clear to us, that there is some very singular perversion of language, or obliquity of judgment, implied in these remarks, which if taken in their natural and obvious sense, are directly at variance with the plainest suggestions of reason, and the letter and spirit of Scripture. Instead of being bound, as the writer of them supposes, to exclude all religious considerations in giving his vote upon a subject connected with religion, the representative is undoubtedly bound on that, and on every other occasion, whether of a public or private character, to act under the influence of religious considerations. 'Whether we eat or drink, or *whatever we do*,' we are directed in Scripture to '*do all* to the praise and glory of God.' It is expressly enjoined on rulers in particular, to govern *in the fear of the Lord*. It is in fact the peculiar virtue of religion, as a motive of action, that it is applicable on every occasion, and to every part of

conduct. It is one branch of our religious duty to obey the constitution and laws of the land ; and if the constitution prohibit the establishment of a national church, it is the religious duty of a representative, even though he individually prefer an establishment, to vote against any project of the kind, until the prohibition in the constitution be repealed ; but even in voting against an establishment, he is or ought to be as much influenced by religious considerations, as if he voted in favor of it. It is impossible, in short, to conceive a case, either in public or private life, in which it is not the duty of every member of the community to act under the influence of religious motives ; and in proportion as an individual is more completely influenced by such motives to the exclusion of any others, which have their origin in mere expediency, so much the more probable is it that he will avoid error, and render himself acceptable to the Great Judge, to whom he is ultimately to give an account of the deeds done in the body.

The assertion that the union of Church and State consists in being influenced in the exercise of temporal power by religious belief, seems to argue a great looseness of ideas upon the whole subject. The being influenced in the exercise of temporal power by religious belief is a particular state of mind, or, if habitual, a particular trait of character in individuals ;—the union of Church and State is a form of political institutions. To say that one of them is the other is about as correct as it would be to say that courage is a military despotism—temperance a constitutional monarchy—or the love of liberty a republic. If the remark alluded to be merely—as is probable enough—an incorrect mode of expressing the idea that a disposition in individuals to act from religious motives has a tendency to bring about a union of Church and State, the objection is rather more intelligible, though not much better founded than on the other construction. Religious motives are, as we have shewn, the best under which we can possibly act, and tend of course to produce the best possible results. If one of these results be the union of Church and State, it could only be because this union is the best of all possible modes of regulating the relations between religion and government. Hence the committee, in affirming that a disposition in individuals to act from religious motives tends to bring about a union of Church and State, affirm by implication that this union is an excellent institution—which is probably not their intention, and is, at all

events not the opinion of the people of the United States. If a union of Church and State be, as is generally supposed, and as the committee appear to think, a dangerous institution, it is certain that the surest way of steering clear of it, is for the public agents to act in all cases to the best of their ability on the best and purest motives, which are, undoubtedly, the fear of God and the honest intention to do His will. The moment you allow any weight to considerations of mere expediency in opposition to these, you open a door to corruptions of every kind, which are the more likely to gain admittance in proportion as the names they bear are more respectable and plausible.

For ourselves, so far are we from apprehending any practical inconvenience from the influence of religious motives in legislation, that we should consider an extension of this influence as one of the most fortunate things that could possibly happen to the country. The great evil in practical legislation is the influence of corrupt, or low and narrow views. How often does the passage or rejection of an important law depend entirely upon the relative strength of political parties, divided perhaps by considerations wholly foreign to the subject of it! During the last session of Congress we have seen the newspapers of a political party declaring, with great satisfaction, that the question of the right of a member elect to take his seat was decided by a *party vote*. When the motive is not absolutely corrupt, how often is it of a low and narrow cast! A legislator votes in favor of a rail-road because it passes through his own town, or against it because it does not. If he happen to live in a cotton-growing state, he opposes the protecting policy; if in a manufacturing one, he supports it; if he remove from the latter to the former, he leaves his former creed behind him and takes up that of his new residence. The only sure way of rising above the influence of improper motives, whether absolutely vicious, or only narrow, is to give no weight to any considerations but those of duty, or in other words, religious principle. The individual, whether in public or private life, who pursues this course, is sure of doing right as far as he knows what right is; and we are all but too well aware, that our practical errors are much less frequently the result of not knowing what is right than of a disinclination to do it.

We have enlarged rather more upon this objection than its real importance perhaps rendered necessary, which, as we have remarked above, and have since endeavored to show, is

very little. The other, which is founded on the practical inconvenience that would result from suspending the transportation of the mail and the delivery of letters on Sunday, is the only one which appears to us to have any considerable weight. But even this is not, in our opinion, of a very decisive character.

It is, no doubt, true, that the rapidity of the progress of all private business would, to a certain extent, be diminished by the change in question; but it will hardly be pretended that the inconvenience resulting from this diminution, is of such a kind as to make out a case of necessity, which would authorise the community in waiving the observation of the moral and religious rules, of which they acknowledge the obligation in all others. The committee, certainly, have not proved or attempted to prove the reality of any such necessity. They say that if you stop the mail one day in seven, you retard by one seventh the advancement of the country. This reasoning supposes that the mail is the only instrument that is or can be employed for the advancement of civilisation—a supposition which is obviously incorrect. It is, no doubt, one and a very useful instrument for that purpose. The objection more correctly stated would be, that if you stop the mail one day in seven you diminish by one seventh the efficacy of the Post-Office in producing the advantages that naturally result from it. This is true; but it is only an application to a particular branch of labor of the general proposition, that if you suspend the labor of the community one day in seven, you make the labor of the community one seventh part less productive than it otherwise would be. This we know, or at least may admit for argument's sake; but notwithstanding this, there are certain religious and moral considerations, which induce the community as a general rule to suspend all their labors one day in seven. Why should not this rule be applied to the labor employed in carrying the mails as well as to all the rest? As the committee think that it ought not to be, it was their business to tell us why; but it is obviously not sufficient to tell us, that the labor of the Post-Office department would be immediately, in the case supposed, one seventh part less productive in a given time than it was before. This is a matter of course, and the principle is as true of all the other departments as of the Post-Office. But why deduce from it in regard to that department a conclusion, which you do not deduce from it in regard to any other? Why, in short, make the practice of the Post-Office department an

exception to that of all the others? This, as we have repeatedly said, is the real question, and it is one to which the committee have not attempted to reply.

Although we have admitted, for the sake of the argument, in the above remarks, that the labor of the community, if suspended one day in seven, is for that reason one seventh part less productive, we are far from thinking that such is in fact the case. We believe, on the contrary, that this is one of the instances in which two and two do not make four. Whether we consider labor as intended to produce the immediate result, wealth, or the more remote one, well-being physical and moral, we have no hesitation in saying, that we believe it becomes more instead of less productive by an occasional suspension. We all know that our faculties cannot be kept forever on the stretch. Without the nightly intervention of that 'blessed thing, sleep,' as Coleridge calls it, to suspend our toils and labors, soothe our cares, and recruit our strength, we should all, in a very short time, go mad and die. But the preservation of a sound, healthy, active and cheerful condition of our nature requires, in addition to this, an occasional suspension of labor for longer periods; and it was, doubtless, in the kind view of accommodating his commands to the constitution which he had given us, that the Creator prescribed the observance of a weekly day of rest. The man, who constantly pursues his worldly objects without allowing himself a moment's leisure, gradually acquires, by a sort of moral gravitation, an accelerated and feverish intensity of action, which, if not checked in one way or another, ends in extravagance, bankruptcy and ruin. By wholly diverting his thoughts one day in seven from business, and turning them upon the high and glorious subject of his intellectual and moral relations to God, his fellow-men, and the universe, he cools the fever of his mind; and when he takes up his affairs again on Monday morning, he is surprised to find with how much clearer a judgment he considers the plans and purposes of which he took leave on Saturday. He now perceives errors, that before escaped his attention,—rejects imprudent projects that before presented themselves in tempting colors to his heated fancy—and if his gains at the end of the week be one seventh less, they will probably at the end of the year, be seventy fold more. Instead of being a miserable bankrupt, he will be a thriving, healthy, happy man. We have no hesitation in saying that the fault we have here indicated of a too urgent

pursuit of worldly gain, is a common trait in the character of our countrymen, and that a more exclusive devotion of the Sabbath to repose and religious contemplation would be a most wholesome corrective of the evil. We strain every nerve to the utmost, employ every cent of capital that we own or can borrow, and not content with obtaining an honorable subsistence for ourselves and our families by the regular practice of our respective callings, grasp, with an agonising effort, at any project that holds out the least prospect of extraordinary gain. What follows? A few persons amass immense fortunes, the possession of which has no very favorable effect upon their own characters, or those of their children. The rest—at the first little convulsion in the world of business—are swept—like dead leaves before a November blast—into the gulf of bankruptcy. It would be vain to deny that the general habits of our active men of every class correspond in the main with this description; and it is, in our opinion, equally certain, that a real and *bona-fide* suspension of worldly cares one day in seven would greatly improve—were it only by its negative and sedative effects—the state of mind which leads to these extravagant efforts and their disastrous results. It is, in short, clear to us, that the labor of the community—by being suspended one day in seven—becomes, not less, but on the contrary a great deal more productive of mere wealth, than it otherwise would be.

But this view of the subject, however important, is by no means the most so of those which may be taken of it. The object of all this toil and trouble—these convulsive strainings and desperate enterprises—is after all the acquisition of the means of subsistence—‘meat, clothes, and fire,’—nothing more. But this, though a legitimate object of pursuit in life, is far from being the only one. It belongs entirely to our lower and animal nature. The intellectual and moral principle—the God within the mind—that loftier and nobler portion of our being, by which we hold affinity with the Sublime Spirit that created and informs the universe—this too has its claims; and they are of a far more urgent and momentous character than those of the other. But how can we do them justice if our thoughts are forever absorbed, without the interruption of a day, an hour, a moment, in the routine of business? Our intellectual and moral nature is refined and exalted by study, solitary musing, or instructive conversation on elevated subjects—by the interchange of kind

and charitable feelings—by the contemplation of the goodness of the Creator, as shewn forth in the majesty, harmony, and beauty of his works. If we mean to rise in the scale of being above the tools we work with, or the brute animals that we employ, we must allow ourselves time for these ennobling and delightful pursuits. The merchant must not nail himself forever to his counter like a bad shilling; and the lawyer should remember that there is one Supreme Court in which his precedents will lose their authority, and his special pleas their importance—that there is one case, and that his own, which he must finally argue upon its merits. Let it be enough, that the business of the world is pursued with unremitted activity and perseverance from Monday morning to Saturday night. When Sunday comes, let the weary be at rest—let the laborer of every kind cease from his toil, and go up to the house of God, not to ruminate upon the affairs of the preceding week, or to lay new plans for the coming one—but to yield up his whole soul to the current of lofty contemplations which the scene and the service are fitted to inspire—to feel the ravishing influence of sacred song—to indulge the devout aspirations that lift the humble spirit in holy trances to the footstool of the Almighty. Nor let him think it too hard, if in the mean time his letters remain unread in the Post-Office. They will not grow stale before tomorrow. His communion with God is of much more consequence than his correspondence with his agent or consignee. Whatever the mere man of business may think of it, this is, after all, a matter of high importance. Unless the deepest thinkers have erred in their conclusions from the most mature experience and reflection—unless the strongest feelings within us are all delusion—unless the word of revelation be a lie—it is certain that our mysterious nature is only one of the transitory forms of a permanent existence—that our lot hereafter will be determined forever by the use that we make of our faculties here. ‘As the tree falleth, so it must lie.’ If we voluntarily degrade our minds in this world to the level of the brutes, it is impossible that we can start in the race of eternity with so much advantage as others, who have done their best to strengthen, exalt and purify the intellectual and moral principle that survives the body. These are at once glorious and fearful truths. They are truths which the greatest sages and lawgivers of every age from Moses to Numa, and from Numa to Franklin, have kept in view in their political creations. No state of ancient or

modern times ever obtained any real stability, of which the government did not rest, in one way or another, on the steadfast and immovable rock of Religion. Under our free and happy forms of political constitution, the only way in which this salutary principle can produce its beneficial effects, is by its influence on public opinion; and however much we may regret to differ from the very respectable committee, whose report we have been examining, and the writers who concur with them, we have no hesitation in expressing our conviction that the people of the United States have nothing better, in regard to their political concerns, to hope or wish, than that all their agents should be *influenced in the exercise of temporal power by religious belief*. This would not bring about, as the writer above alluded to supposes, without apparently attaching any very distinct meaning to the terms, a *union of Church and State*; but it would procure us the blessing of Providence—a wise, liberal, efficient, and above all, honest administration of the government in all its branches—a condition of general and constantly progressive prosperity—and to sum up all in one word—peace.

On reviewing the above, we perceive that we have omitted to notice the suggestion thrown out in the Report, that this subject comes properly within the jurisdiction of the State Governments; but we cannot think that the committee would themselves, on further reflection, maintain this doctrine. The regulation of Post-Offices and Post-Roads is plainly attributed by the letter of the constitution to the United States.

ART. VIII.—*Letters and Journals of Lord Byron. With Notices of his Life.* By THOMAS MOORE. Vol. I.

When Dr. Clarke, the traveller, was entering the waters of Egypt, he saw the corpse of one who had fallen in the battle of the Nile, rise from its grave in the ocean, and move slowly past the vessels of the fleet. It was with somewhat similar misgivings, that we saw the resurrection of Lord Byron from the waves of time, which soon close over the noblest wreck, and leave no trace of the spot where it went down. Unless there were something new to be said in his favor, it seemed needless to bring him again before the public eye. The world